

**Comments and Responses
LWCF GRANT PROGRAM**

TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1. CORP Issues	Issue 5 in the CORP is "Preservation and Protection of California's Cultural Heritage. LWCF is an outdoor recreation program and the narrative for this issue drifts away from the purposes and intent of the LWCF Act.	Comment reviewed; item deleted.
2. CORP Issues	Each State shall develop a priority rating system for selecting projects that ensures the fair and equitable evaluation of all projects and at a minimum places the strongest emphasis on project selection criteria that conforms directly to priority needs.	No Change. All criteria is directly related to CORP.
3. NEPA	Additional clarification needed on NEPA comments.	Changes made as requested.
4. Federal Appraisal Standards	Add the website address to Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (UASFLA)	Change made as requested.

5. 6(f)3	http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/land-ack . For the 6(f) 3 map, add Number 11, total acreage.	Change made as requested.
6. ESF Form	Add the current Environmental Screening Form and Categorical Exclusion form.	Change made as requested.
7. Criteria	For population and population density it is important to provide recreational opportunities in densely populated areas, but, then how do rural areas compete?	Five points added for public participation. Points reduced for this criterion, and one bonus point added for users from outside the service areas.
8. OPSP Ref. in Guide	Will there be a reference regarding the Open Project Selection Process in the LWCF guide?	Reference added as requested.
9. Local Share	Question regarding page 12 of the procedural guide, second question, regarding "What is the maximum Grant amount?" Unclear on how to find the maximum grant request dollar amount of "5% of the annual local agency share".	Reference added in guide. Local annual allocation will be posted on the Department's website.

10. Ranking Criteria	Please include in your agency's rating and ranking criteria points for serving low income areas based on either percentage of persons in poverty or on median income (both data available from year 2000 census). This additional criteria would help to assist poorer communities of the State provide recreation opportunities for their under served residents.	Criterion 2, Issues I and III address this comment.
11. Population Density	Population criterion is a disadvantage for agencies in less populated areas.	Changes made in criterion 5, Population and Population Density.
12. Criteria	<p>Priority Recreation Venues</p> <p>Priority 1 Trails (include jogging paths)</p> <p>Priority 3 Natural areas and cultural areas with public access for recreational use (These areas take a lot of space for cities for small cities that are built out.)</p> <p>Golf Facilities</p>	No change. Recreation Venues in the criterion are based on the document, "Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California – 2002", and cannot be changed.

	<p>Priority 7 Golf Facilities (Remove)</p> <p>6</p> <p>Priority 8 Snow play areas (Find equivalent for areas with no snow)</p> <p>Priority 9 Skate park areas (Put higher than snow areas)</p> <p>Other</p> <p>Add Dog Parks</p>	
13. CORP Issues	<p>Issue III: Access to public parks and recreation resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest adding: Projects that provide park or open space in higher density urban areas. 	Issues based on CORP and cannot be changed.
14. CORP Issues	<p>Issue V: Statewide leadership in parks and outdoor recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects which demonstrate a high degree of creativity and which result in the development 	Issues based on CORP and cannot be changed.

<p>15. CORP Issues</p>	<p>of new skills for staff and managers. Is this important? NO. Suggest removing this criterion.</p> <p>15 Points: Why no range for points? E.g. 11-15 points, 6-11, etc. Seems like scores would be either/or.</p>	
<p>16. Project Specific Criteria</p>	<p><i>Cost-Use Benefit</i> This seems extremely objective. Analysis that cannot be substantiated in the grant process. Sometimes open space parkland is more valuable than projected high use.</p>	<p>Comment considered. No change. Point range not feasible.</p>
<p>17. Signage</p>	<p>Is State Parks really going to send signs to the grantees? Seems impractical. Cities typically order their own.</p>	<p>Comment considered. No change. Criterion based on need for recreation use.</p>
<p>18. Surcharge</p>	<p>(Bad news, this should never vary. Sounds arbitrary.) This surcharge is difficult to take into account when compiling a budget for the grant and matching funds. State</p>	<p>Sign will be sent to grantee.</p> <p>Comment reviewed. Surcharge formula is based on federal requirements.</p>

<p>19. Eligible Cost</p>	<p>Parks should take out the administrative costs up front for the entire program. This is done with the Bond Acts.</p> <p>Add: promotional/educational materials.</p>	<p>Comment reviewed. No change. Promotional/educational materials are not eligible.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---